October 2, 2015
Terry Schuman, P. E.
Bay Engineering, Inc.
2661 Riva Road, Building 800
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

RE: Review of the June 4, 2015 Forest Stand Conservation Plan (FCP), Annapolis Neck, LLC Property

Mr. Schuman,

Following are Department of Neighborhood and Environmental Progams and Planning and Zoning Comments regarding the Forest Conservation plan for Annapolis Neck, LLC:

#### 1. Sheet 1

Revise the FSD as per comments provided by Mr. Biba on July 14, 2015. Revise the Forest Calculations on sheet 1 accordingly.

Show on the plans how the required reforestation as per the forest conservation act worksheet will be met. Show all street trees (species, size, and location).

## 2. Sheet 2:

Some specimen trees are not labeled and the trees 24" to < 30" are not shown clearly. Please show all 24 - 30" trees colored by condition and labeled in **bold** type.

Show the limit of disturbance (LOD) on the plans. Show the existing and proposed grades in and near the tree preservation areas. Show all trees 24" and greater inside the LOD and within 15' of the LOD. Provide information on the proposed retaining wall (height, grades, etc). Show all required tree preservation measures, including tree protection fencing and root prune locations, on the plans.

The tree preservation areas surrounding trees 3, 13, 22, 37, 45, 105, 117, and 120 will need to be increased significantly for these trees to thrive. Proposed development is taking place to close to most of these trees and will quite likely create hazardous/dying trees.

## 3. Sheet 5:

Show the areas for reforestation in areas not already in existing tree canopy. Limit tree planting in the critical root zones of existing trees. Use bare root 1" diameter trees. Please include species to be planted.

#### 4. Sheet 6:

Item 10.1: include invasive species control

Item 10.2: ....at least three years subsequent to completion of construction activities.

Item 12: Minimum watering shall be considered to be weekly applications .....

# Stormwater Management, Plans and Computations

- 1. The total pre and post development drainage areas do not equal each other. Pre development is 14.45 Acres and the post development is 14.50 Acres.
- 2. The pre-development drainage area map is not correctly shown. With the ridge in the middle of the property where the existing houses are now, there should be two separate major drainage areas. If both drainage areas are ultimately reaching the existing SWM BMP not shown on the plans, the delineation for these drainage areas may need to expand and show the point of observation at the pond, and not at the east property line.
- 3. The pre-development time of concentration breakdown shown on sheet 7 has the following discrepancies when compared to the TR-55 provided in the SWM Computations:
  - a. The flow for segment B is shown at 3.9% with a Tc of 0.074 hours on the plans. The computations show the slope to be at 4.0% with a Tc of 0.073 hours.
  - b. The flow segment C is shown to be at 7.8% on the plans. The computations show the slope to be at 8.0%.

### Planning and Zoning

Below, please find, Site Design Review comments based upon the revised conceptual development plans, dated April 2015, submitted with the Forest Stand Delineation and Wetland Delineation Report. Many of the Department's original comments are reiterated herein, as the applicant neglected to adequate address those comments. Additional comments are included based upon the revised site design:

- 1. Site layout should shift to better respect the existing forest, specimen trees and the site's natural resources, especially those specimen trees located to the rear of the site,
- 2. Site layout should be more fluid with respect to the adjacent Bay Village development, ie., the two developments should look, feel and flow as one,
- 3. The 10,880 sq.ft. proposed retail building should be flipped with the parking lot so as to anchor the new, entrance corner,

- 4. Pedestrian circulation should comport with the hierarchy established with the streetscape, including proper pedestrian crossings and connection to the adjacent Bay Village development,
- 5. Please identify the proposed or potential uses, not the exact tenant, of each structure delineated on the conceptual site plan,
- 6. Parking proposed along Bay Village Drive extended requires backing/turning movements close to the proposed intersection with Georgetown Road extended. This design should be corrected to relocate parking further from the intersection,
- 7. Please identify lanes, and turning movements at the proposed entrance from Bay Ridge Road, at all four legs of the intersection,
- 8. Building and parking lot layout should be consistent throughout the site, whereby establishing a streetscape with an emphasis and hierarchy on Georgetown Road and Bay Village Drive extended. Parking lot layout appears disconnected and dysfunctional,
- 9. True mixed-use, in a more vertical form (multi-story) with structured parking will better establish an architectural vocabulary, village center context and allow for natural resource preservation. The plan is far too suburban with standalone, one-story buildings with surface parking,
- 10. The turning radii along proposed Georgetown Road appear excessive, overly suburban in nature,
- 11. Site plan is auto dominate with little emphasis on the pedestrian form or movement,
- 12. Proposed trash enclosures should relocated from main entrance drive to either within the buildings or to the rear of the buildings,
- 13. Proposed utility locations and stormwater management facilities appear to conflict with possible street tree locations. The streetscape should drive the utility locations.

Please contact me if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Frank Biba, AICP, LEED AP Chief, Environmental Programs

Dept. of Neighborhood and Environmental Programs

410 263-7946

fjb@annapolis.gov

cc: Maria Broadbent Pete Gutwald